



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/990,341	11/20/2001	Scott Montgomery	268/262	2692

34313 7590 05/20/2005

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP  
4 PARK PLAZA  
SUITE 1600  
IRVINE, CA 92614-2558

EXAMINER
----------

COSIMANO, EDWARD R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3639

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary****Application No.**

09/990,341

**Applicant(s)**

MONTGOMERY ET AL.

**Examiner**

Edward R. Cosimano

**Art Unit**

3639

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 27-38 and 46-59 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-26, 39-45 and 60-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/20/01.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

1. Applicant's claim for the benefit of an earlier filing data under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 120 is acknowledged.

2. The drawings are objected to because

A) the following errors have been noted in the drawings:

(1) as can be seen in fig. 1 and from the context of the disclosure between pages 2-4 & 7-9 where applicant consistently references indicia 104, in fig. 1 "10.4" should be -104--.

(2) The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description, note:

(a) reference legend 104 as disclosed in the paragraphs located between pages 2-4 & 7-9.

(b) reference legend 405 as disclosed in the paragraph located between page 28, line 7, and page 29, line 3, Turning now to Figs. 4-7 and 33, ... conventional computer hardware, including a user interface 402 with a keyboard 403, printer 404, display 405, and optional scale 406 for ... a single memory device, it should be understood that it can be implemented in a multitude of memory devices as well."

(c) reference legends 427 & 435 as disclosed in the paragraph between page 35, line 7, and page 36, line 2, "Referring specifically to Fig. 5, ... system 306 comprises postage dispensing modules 427, which ... and a communications module 435. The ... 308. The communications module 435 is configured ... indicia). The communications module 435 is ... link 316 (such as, e.g., transmitting tracking ID requests and receiving tracking ID's).".

(d) reference legends 886, 890 & 896 as described in the paragraph located:

(1) at page 71, lines 5-17, "Specifically, the postage dispensing/refund ... delivery status information from, the master

tracking computer system 890 over the communications link 896.”;

(2) between page 71, line 18, and page 72, line 6, “The database management ... the master tracking computer system 890. As will ... refund information filtered by the filtering module 1145.”; and

(3) between page 73, line 10 and page 74, line 4, “The tracking information maintenance ... each centralized postage-issuing computer system 886 over the communications links 896. The confirmatory ... with any refunded postage transaction has been delivered.”;.

(3) The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(4) because reference character “414” has been used to designate both:

(a) “end user database 414” as disclosed in the paragraph located between page 28, line 7, and page 29, line 3, Turning now to Figs. 4-7 and 33, the structural details ... an end user database 414 that contains ... that it can be implemented in a multitude of memory devices as well.”; and

(b) a “tracking ID request module 414”, as disclosed in the paragraph located:

(1) at page 29, lines 4-19, “The mail handling modules 412 include a tracking ID request module 414, postage ... 422. The tracking ID request module 414 is configured ... with the tracking ID request module 414, the request ... the centralized postage-issuing computer system 305/306/307.”; and

(2) between page 35, line 7, and page 36, line 2, “Referring specifically to Fig. 5, the centralized postage-issuing computer system 306 ... the tracking ID request module 414 in ...

link 316 (such as, e.g., transmitting tracking ID requests and receiving tracking ID's)."; and

(c) a "sender identification request module 414" as disclosed in the paragraph between page 64, line 19, and page 65, line 8, "Referring to Fig. 37, and ... Fig. 34. The sender identification request module 414 then generates a sender identification request with the associated tracking ID (step 1402). The ... transmits the sender identification request over the communications link 384 (step 1404).".

(4) The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description, note:

(a) reference legends 426 & 434 of fig. 5 as this figure is disclosed in the paragraph between page 35, line 7, and page 36, line 2, "Referring specifically to Fig. 5, ... system 306 comprises postage dispensing modules 427, which ... and a communications module 435. The ... 308. The communications module 435 is configured ... indicia). The communications module 435 is ... link 316 (such as, e.g., transmitting tracking ID requests and receiving tracking ID's).".

(b) reference legend 203 of fig. 16 as this figure is described in the paragraphs between page 52, line 17, and page 55, line 4, "Turning now to ... has experience, can be used.".

(c) reference number 1202 of fig. 31 as this figure is described in the paragraphs located between page 74, line 5, and page 76, line 7, "Referring to specifically Fig. 31, ... tracking ID will be updated as not delivered.".

(5) The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR § 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "414" has been used to designate both a "central computer system" in figs. 3 & 5 (pages 25-31, 35-43, 46, 49 and a communications link in fig. 15.

2.1 Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

A) as required by 37 CFR § 1.84(p(5)) and 37 CFR § 1.121(e) the specification lacks an explicit reference to the nature of:

(1) reference legend(s):

(a) reference legends 426 & 434 of fig. 5 as this figure is disclosed in the paragraph between page 35, line 7, and page 36, line 2, “Referring specifically to Fig. 5, ... system 306 comprises postage dispensing modules 427, which ... and a communications module 435. The ... 308. The communications module 435 is configured ... indicia). The communications module 435 is ... link 316 (such as, e.g., transmitting tracking ID requests and receiving tracking ID’s).”;

(b) reference legend 203 of fig. 16 as this figure is described in the paragraphs between page 52, line 17, and page 55, line 4, “Turning now to ... has experience, can be used.”; and

(c) reference number 1202 of fig. 31 as this figure is described in the paragraphs located between page 74, line 5, and page 76, line 7,

“Referring to specifically Fig. 31, ... tracking ID will be updated as not delivered.”.

In this regard, it is noted that merely mentioning either a feature or a number without mentioning the device or operation or number or feature relies on the drawing to provide support for the disclosure and not to aid in the understanding of the invention, as is the purpose of the drawings (37 CFR § 1.81(a,b)).

B) the following errors have been noted in the specification:

(1) as can be seen in fig. 24 and from the context of the paragraphs between page 61, line 12, and page 62, line 13, “At steps 1012 and 1014, the postage validation computer system 362 receives the self-validating postage indicium from the centralized postage-issuing computer system 356 and displays its contents to the postal verifier. In particular, the communications interface 882 then, under control of the communications module 892, receives the self-validating postage indicium from the centralized postage-issuing computer system 356 over the communications link 368 (step 1012), and the postage scanning station 884 displays its contents to the postal verifier (step [[1014]] 1012). At step [[1016]] 1014, the verifier then manually compares the contents of the self-validating postage indicium to the human-readable information (e.g., mailing date, postage amount, origin of mail piece, and destination of mail piece) on the mail piece. If the contents of the self-validating postage indicium do not match the human-readable information, this is an indication of likely fraudulent use of a postage indicium and is treated as such.

At steps [[1018-1020]] 1016-1018, the postal verifier validates the postage indicium itself by operating the postage indicia validation module 894. In particular, the public key association submodule 896 obtains from the set of public keys 897 the public key corresponding to the Certificate Serial Number (item #3 in Table 2) within the postage indicium (step [[1018]] 1016). The digital signature verification submodule 898 then verifies the digital signature of the postage indicium to determine if they are consistent (step [[1020]] 1018). If

the verification process returns a Boolean true, this indicates that the postage indicium was in fact generated by a secure central computer 356 for a mail piece of the same approximate weight, origin and destination as the mail piece being processed. If copy fraud is to be detected, a copy fraud detection process using unique identifiers or similar to the process disclosed with respect to Fig. 14 can be utilized.

After the postage has been validated or rejected, the database management module 893 stores the postage information, along with the results of the validation process (step [[1022]] 1020). If valid, the mail piece is then submitted for normal delivery processing (step [[1024]] 1022).

It should be noted that rather than have the postal verifier validate the postage indicium, the centralized postage-issuing computer system 356 itself can validate the postage indicium. In this case, the postage indicia validation module 894 will be located in the centralized postage-issuing computer system 356. Thus, after the centralized postage-issuing computer system 356 retrieves the self-validating postage indicium corresponding to the indexing identifier at step 1008, it will validate the postage indicium itself using a corresponding public key. If it is valid, the centralized postage-issuing computer system 356 will transmit a Boolean true, along with the already validated postage indicium, to the postage validation computer system 362, which will then perform postage validation steps [[1012, 1014, 1020, and 1022]] 1014, 1016, 1018 and 1020. If it is invalid, the centralized postage-issuing computer system 356 will transmit a Boolean false to the postage validation 'computer system 362, which will then store the results of the validation process as being invalid at step 1020.”, it appears that the applicant has used the wrong reference numbers, and maybe these number should be as indicated above.

(2) from the context of the paragraph located between page 68, line 19, and page 69, line 4, “It should be noted that the date of this query is August 23, 2001, and the postage transactions in question were completed three days



earlier. The USPS delivery status for the first package presents the phrase “Your item was accepted at 10pm on August 21 in Palo Alto, CA 94301”. This phrase is misleading in that it infers that the USPS actually took possession of this package. In reality, it only indicates the date/time in which the tracking information was posted to the master tracking computer system. When this message persists for days or weeks, one ~~[[much]]~~ must conclude that the tracking ID was indeed issued, but the package never entered the postal system. As another example, an audit inquiry can reveal all postage transaction information in a specific user account.”, applicant’s use of the word “much” is confusing and maybe this word should be –must–, as indicated above.

(3) as can be seen in figs. 25 & 30 and from the context of the paragraphs located:

(a) at page 71, lines 5-17, “Specifically, the postage dispensing/refund eligibility modules 1126 include a communications module 1134, database management module 1136, tracking ID request module 1138, postage indicium request validation module 1140, postage indicium generation module.1142, delivery status request module 1143, filtering module 1145, refund inquiry module 1147, and refund display module 1149. The delivery status request module 1143 is configured for generating a request for the delivery status for each tracking ID stored in the postage database 1130. The filtering module 1145 is configured for variously generating refund information by filtering and formatting the postage transaction information retrieved from the postage database 1130, as will be described in further detail below. In addition to being configured for providing the communications previously described with respect to the communications module 434, the communications module 1134 is configured for transmitting delivery status requests to, and receiving confirmatory delivery status information from, the master

tracking computer system [[890]] 390 over the communications link [[896]] 396."; and

(b) between page 71, line 18, and page 72, line 6, "The database management module 1136 is configured for storing and retrieving pertinent information in and from the customer database 1128, postage database 1130, and finance database 1132. This function includes storing and retrieving a tracking ID and an associated delivery status, and updating that associated delivery status with confirmatory delivery status information received from the master tracking computer system [[890]] 390. As will be described in further detail, the confirmatory delivery status information indicates whether a mail piece carrying a tracking ID has, in fact, been delivered. The refund inquiry module 1147 is configured for generating an inquiry for postage refund information. In the illustrated embodiment, the inquiry contains a user account ID and password and the refund inquiry, which as previously discussed, can include various types. The refund display module 1149 is configured for displaying on the display 1127 the postage refund information filtered by the filtering module 1145.";

(c) between page 73, line 10 and page 74, line 4, "The tracking information maintenance modules 1170 include a communications module 1174, tracking ID allocation module 1176, database management module 1178, and refunded postage polling module 1180. In addition to being configured for providing the communications previously described with respect to the communications module 474, the communications module 1174 receives delivery status requests from, and transmits confirmatory delivery status information to, each centralized postage-issuing computer system [[886]] 386 over the communications links [[896]] 396. The confirmatory delivery status information is obtained from tracking stations (not shown), which scan tracked mail pieces when

they are delivered. The tracking ID allocation module 1176 is configured for performing the same functions as the tracking ID allocation module 476 previously described in the master tracking computer system 310. The database management module 1178 is configured for storing and retrieving assigned tracking ID's and associated postage information (including delivery status) to and from the tracking information database 1172. The database management module 1178 is further configured for updating the tracking information database 1172 with refund information. That is, if a specific postage transaction has been refunded, the database management module 1178 will associate a refund indicator with the postage information relating to the specific postage transaction. The refunded postage polling module 1180 periodically polls the tracking information database 1172 to determine if a mail piece associated with any refunded postage transaction has been delivered.”;

each reference to “886” should be -386--, “890” should be -390--, and “896” should be -396--, as indicated above.

(4) as can be seen in fig. 32 and from the context of the paragraph located between page 76, line 8, and page 77, line 5, “Referring to specifically Fig. 32, and with general reference to Fig. 29, the procedures for issuing a refund will now be described. At step 1230, the account administrator operates the user interface 1123 of the centralized postage-issuing computer system 386 to make a refund inquiry. The type of refund inquiry can be, e.g., any of the three refund inquiries described above (refund eligible inquiry, audit review, or refund pattern audit), but for purposes of the following explanation the refund eligible inquiry will be described. At step 1232, the database management module 1136 retrieves for a specific user account the postage transaction information from the postage database 1130. At step 1234, the filtering module 1145 selects the postage transaction information representing duplicative postage transaction. In particular, it selects the postage transactions that carry tracking

Art Unit: 3639

ID's that have never been refunded in the past, that are issued for the specific user account, and that have identical key postage transaction items, i.e., postage transaction date, destination zip code, service class, and postage amount. At step 1236, the filtering module 1145 then determines if any of the [[delivery]] statuses for the selected postage transactions indicates that a mail piece has been [[delivered]] refunded. If so, it is determined that a refund for that postage transaction is forthcoming. In this case, the database management module 1136, at step 1238, credits the user's account for the misprint in the finance database 1132. At step 1240, the database management module 1136 then date/time stamps the misprint postage transaction in the postage database 1130. In this manner, the filtering module 1145 will filter out this refunded postage transaction in the future, so that it is not refunded multiple times. At step 1242, the account administrator issues a refund request to the postage refund center 392 of the postal authority (e.g., USPS).”, applicant's references to the word “delivery” is confusing, since this word should reference a -refund-, and not a delivery.

Appropriate correction is required.

4. The specification and drawings have not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification or drawings. Applicant should note the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.52, 37 CFR § 1.74, § 1.75, § 1.84(o,p(5)), § 1.121(a)-1.121(f) & § 1.121(h)-1.121(i).

5. Claims 14-26, 39-45 & 60-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5.1 In regard to claim 14, this claim recites the utility of a “method of validating postage for a postal service”, however the body of the claim merely recites the functions of (1) “generating a postage indicium associated with a mail piece”; (2) “associating an indexing tracking ID with the postage indicium”; (3) “storing the indexed postage indicium within a

Art Unit: 3639

database”; (4) applying the indexing tracking ID to the mail piece”; (5) “reading the indexing tracking ID on the mail piece”; and (6) “retrieving the indexed postage indicium from the database based on the read indexing tracking ID”; where none of these functions would not be considered by one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention as accomplishing intended purpose of the invention, that is “validating postage”, since the retrieved indexed postage indicium is not used to validate postage. Dependent claims 15-26 do not solve this problem.

5.2 In regard to claim 39, this claim recites the utility of a “method of validating postage in a postal system”, however the body of the claim merely recites the functions of (1) “receiving a postage indicium request from a postal authority, wherein the postage indicium request carries an indexing tracking ID and is associated with a mail piece inspected by the postage authority”; (2) “retrieving an indexed postage indicium from a database based on the received indexing tracking ID”; and (3) “transmitting the postage indicium to the postal authority”, where none of these functions would not be considered by one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention as accomplishing intended purpose of the invention, that is “validating postage”, since the retrieved and transmitted indexed postage indicium is not used to validate postage. Dependent claims 40-45 do not solve this problem.

5.3 In regard to claim 60, this claim recites the utility of a “method of verifying a sender of a mail piece”, however the body of the claim merely recites the functions of (1) “receiving a sender identification request from mail recipient computer, wherein the sender identification request carries an indexing tracking ID associated with a mail piece received from a postal authority”; (2) “retrieving indexed sender identification information from a database based on the received indexing tracking ID”; and (3) “transmitting the sender identification information to the mail recipient computer”, where none of these functions would not be considered by one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention as accomplishing intended purpose of the invention, that is “validating a sender”, since the retrieved and transmitted indexed “sender identification information” is not used to validate the sender. Dependent claims 61-64 do not solve this problem.

5.4 For the above reason(s), applicant has failed to particularly point out what is regarded as the invention.

Art Unit: 3639

6. The following is an Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance over the prior art:

7 A) in regard to claim 1, the prior art does not teach or suggest a process that creates and populates a database of stored postage indicia that have been indexed using an unique tracking ID. Claims 1-13 are allowable for the same reason.

B) in regard to claim 14, the prior art does not teach or suggest a process of using a tracking ID that has been read from an item of mail to access a database of stored postage indicia that have been indexed using an unique tracking ID. Claims 15-26 are allowable for the same reason.

C) in regard to claim 27, the prior art does not teach or suggest a machine that creates and populates a database of stored postage indicia that have been indexed using an unique tracking ID so that a tracking ID may be used to retrieve the associated indexed postage indicia. Claims 28-38 are allowable for the same reason.

D) in regard to claim 39, the prior art does not teach or suggest a process that uses a received request including a tracking ID to retrieve from a database of stored postage indicia that have been indexed using an unique tracking ID and then transmits the retrieved postage indicia. Claims 40-45 are allowable for the same reason.

E) in regard to claim 46, the prior art does not teach or suggest a process that creates and populates a database of stored sender information have been indexed using an unique tracking ID. Claims 47-52 are allowable for the same reason.

F) in regard to claim 53, the prior art does not teach or suggest a machine that creates and populates a database of stored sender information that have been indexed using an unique tracking ID so that a tracking ID may be used to retrieve the associated indexed sender information. Claims 54-59 are allowable for the same reason.

G) in regard to claim 60, the prior art does not teach or suggest a process that uses a received request including a tracking ID to retrieve from a database of stored sender information that have been indexed using an unique tracking ID and then transmits the retrieved sender information. Claims 61-64 are allowable for the same reason.

7. Applicant must supply the prior art mentioned in the paragraph located:

A) at page 1, lines 7-18, "In 1992, the United States Postal Service (USPS), acting largely on a formal December 1991 proposal by the inventor, began investigating the feasibility of Pc-based postage technology. The USPS hosted an exploratory meeting, inviting the inventor and the four existing conventional postage meter vendors (Pitney Bowes, Neopost (called Friden at the time), Ascom Hasler, and Franco Postalia) -firms that represented 100% of the US meter market at that time. Subsequent years saw a number of follow-on meetings, and the USPS eventually published a specification in the 1996 Federal Register outlining what the USPS called an "Information Based Postage Indiciu Program (IBIP)." The requirements for the IBIP are currently set forth in a document called "Information Based Indiciu Program (IBIP) -Performance Criteria For Information-Based Indicia and Security Architecture for Open IBI Postage Evidencing Systems (PCIBI-O)," which was published on June 25, 1999 by the USPS, and which is fully and expressly incorporated herein by reference.";

8. The examiner has cited prior art of interest, for example:

A) Sonedaka (JP 02-199939) discloses that an encrypted sender ID may be used to authenticate transmitted information/data.

B) Manduley et al (5,043,908) discloses that additional encrypted or barcoded information in an indicia or located elsewhere on items of mail may be scanned at various points in the delivery process and then the collected data is used to track the item of mail.

C) the Newsbytes article discloses that a customer may enter a tracking ID/number in order to retrieve tracking information from a database.

D) Gilham (5,774,554) discloses that encrypted information on items of mail may be used to retrieve transaction history information and an unique key.

E) Kuebert et al (2002/0165729) which discloses that information located on items of mail may be scanned at various points in the delivery process and then used as an index when creating a database of the collected data so as to track and/or redirect items of mail.

Art Unit: 3639

F) Sansone et al (6,865,560) which discloses that information located on items of mail may be scanned at various points in the delivery process and then used to track the item of mail.

9. Claims 14, 39 & 60 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claim 15-26, 40-45 & 61-64 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As allowable subject matter has been indicated, applicant's response must either comply with all formal requirements or specifically traverse each requirement not complied with. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(b) and section 707.07(a) of the M.P.E.P.

10. The shorten statutory period of response is set to expire 3 (three) months from the mailing date of this Office action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward Cosimano whose telephone number is (571) 272-6802. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30am to 6:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss, can be reached on (571) 272-6812. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-3600.

11.1 The fax phone number for UNOFFICIAL/DRAFT FAXES is (703) 746-7240.

11.2 The fax phone number for OFFICIAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

11.3 The fax phone number for AFTER FINAL FAXES is (703) 872-9306.

04/18/05



Edward R. Cosimano

Primary Examiner A.U. 3629